## In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## **OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS**

No. 11-441V Filed: January 29, 2013 Not for Publication

MILLMAN, Special Master

## DECISION AWARDING ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS<sup>1</sup>

Petitioner filed an Application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs on January 23, 2013. On January 28, 2013, respondent's counsel stated that respondent has no objection to petitioner's Application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs.

In accordance with the General Order #9 requirements, petitioner's counsel attests that petitioner did not incur any costs to pursue his petition.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the special master's action in this case, the special master intends to post this unpublished decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims's website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (Dec. 17, 2002). Vaccine Rule 18(b) states that all decisions of the special masters will be made available to the public unless they contain trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is privileged and confidential, or medical or similar information whose disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy. When such a decision is filed, petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact such information prior to the document's disclosure. If the special master, upon review, agrees that the identified material fits within the banned categories listed above, the special master shall redact such material from public access.

The undersigned finds the request to be reasonable and awards compensation in the amount set forth in petitioner's Application. The court awards \$27,593.14, representing reimbursement for attorneys' fees and costs (\$21,089.60 for attorneys' fees and \$6,503.54 for attorneys' costs). The award shall be in the form of one check made jointly payable to petitioner and Conway, Homer & Chin-Caplan, P.C. in the amount of \$27,593.14.

In the absence of a motion for review filed pursuant to RCFC Appendix B, the clerk of the court is directed to enter judgment herewith.<sup>2</sup>

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 29, 2013 /s/ Laura D. Millman

Laura D. Millman Special Master

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment can be expedited by each party's filing a notice renouncing the right to seek review.